[22nd February 1955

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKKTAVATSALAM :—" The Commissioner of Labour feels that he is not able to determine or verify the claims of workers."

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN :—" When this is the case about moneys due to workers, what about the money due to the Government of Madras? What action has been taken to recover the same? "

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" That is a different question. Government feel that they will not be able to receiver the moneys due to workers unless the judgment of the High Court is reversed. The position will be worse even with reference to Government."

Enquiry into the causes for dead fish in the Bhavani River.

* 177 Q.—DR. A. SREENIVASAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether on or about the 25th December 1954 and for some days thereafter a large number of dead fish was found floating in the Bhavani river in Mettupalayam reaches;

(*b*) whether the fish in the town water-storage tank were also found to die, when the Bhavani water was pumped into it; and

(*c*) what action has been taken to find out the cause for the same, when, by whom and with what result?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" (*a*) The answer is in the affirmative.

" (*b*) The Government have no information.

" (*c*) As soon as a report regarding the death of fish was received the staff of the Fisheries Department at Bhavanisagar conducted necessary investigation to find out the causes. It was found that the death of fish was not due to abnormal condition or adverse biological factors. It was found it was due to the poisoning of waters with bark and dynamites in the upper reaches of the rivers in Western Ghats. The staff of the Fisheries Department have been instructed to have a closer supervision for enforcing strict conservancy measures against such poisoning and pollution."

DR. A. SREENIVASAN :—" Did this give rise to an epidemic of gastro-intestinal disorder in the locality? "

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" I want notice, Sir."

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—" What about the fish? Were they thrown away or eaten up? "

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" I hope that these dead fish which were dead on account of being poisoned were not eaten up by any persons."

22nd February 1955]

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—" Thanks."

SRI A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR :—" Are the Government aware that there are more fish in the Bhavani river than ever came out of it? "

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" Perhaps it is so and Government are trying to exploit them."

Tube wells in the South Arcot district.

* 178 *Q.*—SRI M. ETHIRAJULU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of tube wells sunk so far in the South Arcot district;

(*b*) whether the Government have any proposal to sink any more tube wells; and

(*c*) the cost of the tube wells sunk so far?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" (*a*) One.

" (*b*) The Government are considering a proposal for the sinking of one experimental tube well in Chingleput district.

" (*c*) Roughly Rs. 27,000."

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—MESSAGE FROM THE ASSEMBLY.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I have to announce to the House that I have received the following message, dated the 21st February 1955, from the Hon. the Speaker, Madras Legislative Assembly :—

' In accordance with rule 114 of the Madras Assembly Rules, I transmit a copy of the Madras Plantations Agricultural Income-Tax Bill, 1954 (L.A. Bill No. 30 of 1954), as passed by the Assembly on the 21st February 1955 and signed by me for the recommendations of the Council.

2. I certify that this is a Money Bill within the meaning of Article 199 of the Constitution of India.' "

III.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS PLANTATIONS AGRICULTURAL INCOME-TAX BILL, 1954 (L.A. BILL NO. 30 OF 1954).

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' *That the Madras Plantations Agricultural Income-Tax Bill, 1954 (L.A. Bill* [a] *No. 30 of 1954), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration.*'

" In doing so I would like to point out to this House that the system of levy of land tax in this State has been subjected to the criticism that the burden of tax is not distributed equitably among the different classes of landowners and it is also generally accepted

[a] **Printed as Appendix on pages 44–82 infra.**